

of this species changed twice. Another even more drastic example can be found in *Scotophilus*, where Robbins (1978) showed that the name *S. nigrita* actually referred to the largest African form and not to the medium-sized form, which since then has been called *S. dinganii*. Thus prior to 1978 *S. nigrita* referred to the largest African form and subsequent references (probably) refer to the middle-sized form. These changes, which have a much heavier impact than simply replacing one name by another, have now been accepted by almost everyone. Therefore, I do not see any problem in calling the 55 kHz phonic type *P. mediterraneus* Cabrera, 1904, which clearly was that taxon, and in the future changing the name to one of the older synonyms if it can be proven to be applicable.

The proposal of a neotype for *Vespertilio pygmaeus* seems premature, and I suggest that this name should be treated as a nomen dubium and be ignored. The fact that no objections were received to Case 3073 when it was discussed at a workshop at the 7th European Bat Research Symposium (Krakow, August 1999; see Jones, BZN 57: 116, para. (d)) is of no significance.

In conclusion, I agree with Helversen, Mayer & Kock (BZN 57: 113–114, para. 4) in accepting the neotype of *V. pipistrellus* Schreber, 1774 put forward by Jones & Barratt, and in proposing that the name *P. mediterraneus* Cabrera, 1904 should be put on the Official List instead of *V. pygmaeus* Leach, 1825.

#### Additional references

- Kock, D.** 1999. The Egyptian *Vespertilio pipistrellus aegyptius* Fischer 1829, a nomen dubium. (Mammalia, Chiroptera, Vespertilionidae). *Senckenbergiana Biologica*, **79**: 101–105.
- Qumsiyeh, M.B.** 1982. The bats of Egypt. *Special Publication of the Museum of the Texas Tech. University*, **23**: 1–102.
- Robbins, C.B.** 1978. Taxonomic identification and history of *Scotophilus nigrita* (Schreber) (Chiroptera: Vespertilionidae). *Journal of Mammalogy*, **59**: 212–213.

#### Comments on the proposed conservation of usage of 15 mammal specific names based on wild species which are antedated by or contemporary with those based on domestic animals

(Case 3010; see BZN 53: 28–37, 125, 192–200, 286–288; 54: 119–129, 189; 55: 43–46, 119–120; 56: 72–73, 280–282)

##### (1) Hans-Peter Uerpmann

*Institut für Ur- und Frühgeschichte und Archäologie des Mittelalters, Schloss Hohentübingen, Burgsteige 11, 72070 Tübingen, Germany*

The majority of comments on the application by Gentry, Clutton-Brock & Groves have been in favour of the conservation of usage of 15 mammal specific names based on wild species which are antedated by or contemporary with those based on domestic animals. However, some concerns remain with regard to the consequences of the implementation of the proposals (see Grubb in BZN 56: 280–282). Some of Grubb's concerns relate to issues which are wholly theoretical but it is nonetheless

clear that nomenclatural usages have developed which are not in complete conformity with the strictest interpretation of the Code. Most zoologists, however, are aware that nomenclature is a tool and that names in use must remain stable despite some workers' reservations about deliberately setting aside provisions of the Code.

Comments opposing the application have mainly been made by scientists for whom the problems of names for wild species and their derived domesticates are of only theoretical importance. Most of the supportive comments have been submitted by colleagues dealing with animal history, archaeo- or palaeo-zoology and other fields of science (or day-to-day life) where the separate treatment of wild and domestic animals is of practical concern. Actually, this latter group has long been acting according to the proposal now submitted by Gentry, Clutton-Brock & Groves. A ruling by the Commission in favour of the application will simply legalise the result of an evolution of zoological nomenclature during the past century, and failure of the application is unlikely to reverse this evolution. Most of the workers — including myself — who have been using all or some of the 15 specific names for wild species as listed by Gentry et al. (BZN 53: 34) have done so in complete awareness of the situation (see Gentry et al. in BZN 54: 127–129).

The problem, as perceived by the opponents of the proposal, is that a ruling by the Commission in favour will sanction duplicate names for the 15 species listed by Gentry et al. This is, however, not the case. Domestic animals have been separated from nature by human influences. They are artefacts — as shown by the various attempts to devise schemes for their naming, none of which has been universally accepted (see Groves in BZN 52: 139–140 and Gentry et al. in BZN 53: 29–31). While their Linnaean names, like *Equus caballus*, may be used for them as scientific names, these cannot be attached to the names of their wild ancestors in the form of trinomina. I agree with Grubb when he writes (BZN 56: 282) that 'workers dealing with wild mammals are intelligent beings. They would understand what was meant by *Camelus bactrianus ferus*, *Bubalus bubalis arnee* or *Equus caballus przewalskii*', but is it plausible to suppose that these particular wild species need three names instead of two, and why is there no *Equus caballus caballus*?

The 'confusion' and 'destabilisation' feared by Schodde (BZN 54: 123) and Bock (BZN 54: 125) as a result of approval of the proposal will not materialise because the requested ruling will only stabilise the existing status quo. On the other hand, the unfortunate use of Linnaeus's names, based on domesticates, for wild ungulates in the 1993 edition of *Mammal species of the world*, edited by Wilson and Reeder, is really confusing because of the inconsistent use of younger names, based on wild species, in the case of some carnivores. To excuse this as a minor oversight in the middle of an enormous accomplishment (Gardner in BZN 54: 125) is correct with regard to the accomplishment but is also symptomatic of the instability following the editorial attempt to stick to the earliest names, whether based on a wild species or a domestic derivative.

In reality a ruling in favour of the proposal would neither result in 'dual' names nor would it create a precedence for other fields of zoological nomenclature. The list of animals which were first described and named as domesticates, and for which there are distinct names in use for their wild progenitors, is clearly limited, and thus also would be the ruling by the Commission. In addition, the 'intelligent beings' working with wild mammals (and also those working with domesticates) would continue to

understand that the older, Linnaean names for domesticates are not applicable to the wild species in question.

I hope that the Commission will take a pragmatic approach to the problem of the names for the 15 mammal species based on wild taxa which are antedated by or contemporary with those based on domesticates. I strongly support the proposal by Gentry, Clutton-Brock & Groves.

(2) Anthea Gentry

*Littlewood, Copyhold Lane, Cuckfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex RH17 5EB, U.K.*

Juliet Clutton-Brock

*Working Group on Nomenclature, International Council of Archaeozoology, c/o Department of Zoology, The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.*

Colin P. Groves

*Department of Archaeology and Anthropology, The Australian National University, Canberra, A.C.T. 0200, Australia*

Our application seeks to ensure the stability of 15 specific names for wild species where these are traditionally distinct from those of their domestic derivatives. As Prof H.-P. Uerpmann has noted above, our proposals are not radical and their approval by the Commission will merely ratify current usage. Implementation of the proposals will allow workers the taxonomic freedom to decide whether or not domesticates are included in the species concept. Nonetheless, Dr Peter Grubb (BZN 56: 280–282) has questioned the application and taxonomic limits of the names based on wild populations.

We respond to Grubb's points in the order in which he submitted them.

1. In contrast to Grubb's statement, our application seeks to solve a very long-standing nomenclatural problem and not one of systematics. The taxonomic status of domestic forms in relation to their wild progenitors is a decision for individual workers. In practice, since wild species and their domesticates are recognizable entities and it is usually desirable to separate them, their names are treated as distinct and have been for a number of years.

2. Zoological names are labels for biological taxa. It would be theoretically possible for the name of a wild ancestor to be treated as a subspecies of the name for its domestic derivative, as in the example *Bos taurus primigenius* quoted by Grubb, but this would be eccentric and to our knowledge has not occurred (see also the comment above by Prof H.-P. Uerpmann).

3. Grubb noted that names based on wild populations were introduced for a number of wild taxa distinct from names based on their domestic derivatives (see Bohlken, 1958, for *Bos mutus*, *B. gaur* and *Bubalus arnee*). These names for wild species were subsequently taken up by researchers on domestication. There has been a growing need for their use and they have been increasingly adopted during the second half of the 20th century, as demonstrated by the many supportive comments on this case. There is, in fact, a wealth of literature in the fields of anthropology, archaeo-zoology and the history of domestication, published in papers, reviews,

books, excavation reports and serials (for example, the authoritative *Journal of Archaeological Science*), in which these names are continually employed but these works are not normally cited in *Zoological Record*. To revert now to names based on domestic forms for these wild species (whether or not the domesticates are treated as conspecific) would cause immense confusion and would be a truly retrograde step.

4. There is no confusion with names that refer to both the wild species and its domestic derivative, and there are many examples of such names in use (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*, used for the western Mediterranean wild rabbit and the almost world-wide feral rabbit, is one such). Problems arise only when separate names for the wild species and domestic form have been adopted and that for the latter is then transferred (as has been done by a minority of workers) to the wild taxon.

5. As noted by Prof Uerpmann (above), approval of our proposals by the Commission will merely ratify the current nomenclatural situation: names based on wild populations will continue to be used for wild species and will include those for domestic forms if these are considered conspecific. As noted in para. 1 above, wild species and their domesticates are usually treated as distinct, and thus so are their names, but it is for each worker to decide the taxonomic limits of the wild species (see our previous explanatory comment in BZN 54: 128–129).

6 and 7. Attribution of the correct specific name for a wild species, based on a wild population, will not be affected by modifications to the history of domestication as it unfolds with greater knowledge (see, in particular, the comment by Prof A. Mones in BZN 56: 72–73 on the domestication of the guinea pig).

We commend our application to the Commission.